REMARKS

Upon entry of this Response, claims 1-20 remain pending in the present invention. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the pending claims in view of the following remarks.

Claims 1-20 stand under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,901,286 issued to Danknick ("Danknick"). Anticipation under §102 "requires the disclosure in a single prior art reference of each element of the claim under construction. W.L. Gore & Associates, Inc. v. Garlock, Inc., 220 USPQ 303, 313 (Fed. Cir. 1983). For the reasons that follow, Applicant asserts that the rejection of claims 1-20 is improper. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections of claims 1-18 be withdrawn.

To begin, claim 1 states:

> 1.   A method for providing network access to a web server in a peripheral device, comprising the steps of:
> identifying a request from a client received by a host via a network *to be forwarded to the web server located on the peripheral device locally coupled to the host;*
> *forwarding the request from the host to the web server located on the peripheral device;*
> *transmitting a response to the request from the web server located in the peripheral device to the host;* and
> transmitting the response from the host to the client.

With respect to claim 1 the Office Action states:

> "Danknick teaches a method for providing network access to a web server in a peripheral device, comprising the steps of: identifying a request from a client received by a host (element 9 interpreted as a host; see col. 3, lines 52-62) via a network to be forwarded to the web server located on the peripheral device locally coupled to the host [interpreted as network interface board (NIB) of the peripheral] (FIG. 1, 7, 13A/B, 18; col. 2, lines 1-9; col. 4, lines 50-60, col. 8, lines, col. 11, lines 9-39)". (Office Action page 2).

Applicant respectfully disagrees. Specifically, claim 1 as cited above states that a request is identified from a client that is received by a host via a network to be forwarded to the web server located on the peripheral device locally coupled to the host. Ignoring at least this element, the Office Action identifies two separate hosts as representing a single host as claimed. In this respect, element 9 is a computer that is coupled to the network. No peripheral is locally coupled thereto. To be locally

2

coupled means that the peripheral device is directly coupled to the host itself. Specifically, at column 3, lines 52-62, Danknick states:

> "Plural workstations, such as workstations 9 and 16, are also connected to the LAN 15, and under control of the network operating system these workstations are able to communicate with the NIB 14. One of the workstations, such as workstation 9, may be designated for use as the network administrator.
> In addition, workstations 9 and 16 may each comprise a, standard workstation capable of generating data files, transmitting them into the LAN 15, receiving files from the LAN 15, and displaying and/or processing such files. A workstation may also have a printer connected directly to it."

As described above, element 9 may be an administrator computer and does not receive requests from a client that are to be forwarded to the web server that is located on the peripheral device. For that matter, no web server is located on the peripheral device itself. Rather, the web server is located in the Network Interface Board (NIB) as described below.

In addition, Danknick fails to show or suggest the concept of including the web server on the peripheral device as claimed in claim 1. Specifically, Danknick states:

> "FIG. 7 is a home page 120 of http server 64 located on the NIB 14, as displayed by a browser on the display 70. The page 120 includes a tab frame 121, a viewer frame 122 and an external link frame 124." (Column 6, lines 47-52).

See also Figures 2 and 3 of Danknick that show the web server located in the Network Interface Board (NIB). Thus, no host is locally coupled to the peripheral device that receives a request from a client that is to be forwarded to a web server located on the peripheral device itself as claimed in claim 1. Rather, Danknick shows a Network Interface Board (NIB) that includes a web server that acts as a gatekeeper to provide access to status information regarding the peripheral device such as a printer through the network.

In addition, since the web server of Danknick is not located on the peripheral device, it is not the case that a response is transmitted from the web server back to the host as set forth in claim 1. Rather, Danknick shows or suggests the Network Interface Board (NIB) harvesting information from the peripheral device and then using the web server within the Network Interface Board (NIB) to format such information in the form of a web page that is transmitted to the requesting client. No web server generates a response in the peripheral device as no web server is

3

located on the peripheral device. Also, for the same reason, no response is transmitted from the web server located in the peripheral device to the host.

Accordingly, Applicant once again asserts that the rejection of claim 1 is improper. Therefore, Applicant requests that the rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn. In addition, claim 6 and 11 include elements similar in scope with that of claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 6 and 11 be withdrawn as well. In addition, Applicant requests that the rejection of claims 2-5, 7-10, and 12-14 be withdrawn as depending from claims 1, 6, and 11, respectively.

In addition, claim 3 states:

> 3.   The method of claim 1, wherein the step of forwarding the request from the host to the web server located on the peripheral device further comprises the steps of:
> opening a connection from the host to the peripheral device on a channel dedicated to the web server; and
> transmitting the request from the host to the web server via the channel.

Applicant asserts that Danknick fails to show or suggest the concept of opening a connection from the host to the peripheral device on a channel dedicated to the web server. As was stated in the Response to the previous Office Action, this is because there is no need to open a connection from a host to the peripheral device to establish communication with a web server on a respective channel because the web server is not on the peripheral device. Similarly, no request is transmitted from the host to the web server via the channel. Accordingly, Danknick fails to show or suggest all the limitations of claim 3. Also, claims 8, and 13 include limitations similar in scope with claim 3 as amended. Accordingly, Applicant asserts that Danknick fails to show or suggest all the limitations of claims 3, 8, and 13. Therefore, Applicant requests that the rejection of claims 3, 8, and 13 be withdrawn.

In addition, claim 15 as originally filed provides:

> 15.   A method in a peripheral device to provide access to a web server in the peripheral device from a network through a host, comprising:
> directing a request to the web server, the request being received from a client on the network through the host; and
> transmitting a response to the host to be directed from the host to the client via the network.

With respect to claim 15, the Office Action states:

4

"Danknick teaches a method in a peripheral device to provide
access to a web server in the peripheral device from a network
through a host [interpreted as the NIB that enables communication
between the peripheral device and a network], comprising:
directing a request to the web server, the request being received
from a client on the network through the host (Fig. 1; col. 11, lines
24-44); and transmitting a response to the host to be directed from
the host to the client via the network (col. 11, lines 44-55).

Once again, Applicant respectfully disagrees. In particular, at col. 11, lines
21-44, Danknick states:

"More particularly, in step S1801, a service technician operating
workstation 1 initiates contact with copier 11 by causing workstation
1 to prepare and send an IP-packet to NIB 14 coupled to copier 11.
The IP-packet contains a request for servicing information from
network copier 11.
In the following description, the service technician runs a web
browser on work station 1, and NIB 14, connected to copier 11,
includes an HTTP server which is set up to provide HTML files
related to maintenance communications. Accordingly, the service
technician can initiate contact with copier 11 by merely entering the
address of the maintenance and servicing web page of copier 11
into the browser and executing the browser. Similarly, it is
expected that data will be returned in HTML file format. However, it
is to be understood that the data format used is not limited to
HTML."

As described above, the web server is located in the Network Interface Board
(NIB), not in the peripheral device. In this respect, a request is not directed to a web
server that was received from a client on the network *through the host* as claimed.
Also, the response is not transmitted to the host and thereafter directed to the client
on the network by the host as claimed. Rather, the web server within the Network
Interface Board (NIB) transmits a response directly to the client. In this situation, the
Network Interface Board (NIB) fails to act as a host as set forth in claim 15.

Consequently, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 15 be
withdrawn. In addition, claim 17 includes limitations similar in scope with that of
claim 15. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 15
and 17 be withdrawn. In addition, Applicant requests that the rejection of claims 16
and 18 be withdrawn as depending from claims 15 and 17, respectively.

In addition, claim 19 provides as follows:

19.   The method of claim 1, wherein the step of identifying
a request from a client received by a host via a network to be

5

forwarded to the web server located on the peripheral device locally
coupled to the host, further comprises the steps of:
  registering a host listener with an operating system of
the host to establish a virtual socket for a port dedicated to the web
server located on the peripheral device; and
  listening on the virtual socket with the host listener to
identify the request that is to be forwarded to the web server on the
peripheral device when the request is received by the host from the
client.

Claim 20 includes elements similar in scope with that of claim 19 above. With
respect to claims 19 and 20, the Office Action states:

> "As per claims 19-20, Danknick teaches all the features of these
> claims (see rejection above), Furthermore, Danknick teaches the
> step of establishing of establishing a virtual socket (see col. 8, lines
> 64 to col. 9, line 8)."

Applicant respectfully disagrees. Specifically, at column 8, lines 64 through
column 9, line 8, Danknick states:

> "In step S1319, the JVM executes the applet to obtain information
> from the copier 11 using the SNMP client created in step S1310. In
> particular, the JVM instructs the SNMP client to send an IP packet
> requesting copier information to the SNMP agent 68 within the
> network copier 11. The SNMP client then sends the IP packet to
> the SNMP agent 68 using the IP address obtained in step S1301.
> However, the SNMP agent has a different socket number than that
> of the HTTP server 64. Accordingly, the SNMP client simply sends
> the IP packet to the IP address obtained in step S1301, along with
> a reference to the SNMP agent's socket."

As described above, Danknick merely teaches that the Network Interface
Board (NIB) communicates to the peripheral device using the sockets specified. The
above passage does not describe registering a host listener with an operating
system of the host to establish a virtual socket for port dedicated the web server
located on the peripheral device. Specifically, if the web server is located in the
Network Interface Board (NIB) (interpreted by the Office Action as being the host),
then how is it that the virtual socket is established for a port dedicated to the web
server located on the peripheral device? In addition, Danknick fails to show or
suggest employing a host listener that listens on the virtual socket to identify data
traffic that is to be forwarded to the web server on the peripheral device.
Specifically, how is it that a host listener may be employed in the host itself (the
Network Interface Board (NIB) as interpreted by the Office Action) for data traffic

6

destined to the web server on the peripheral device when the web server is in fact not located on the peripheral device?

Accordingly, Applicant asserts that the rejection of claims 19 and 20 is improper. Therefore, Applicant requests that the rejection of claims 19 and 20 be withdrawn.

In addition, Applicant respectfully points out that claims 1-20 have been rejected herein under §102. As stated above, Anticipation under §102 "*requires the disclosure in a single prior art reference of each element of the claim under construction.* W.L. Gore & Associates, Inc. v. Garlock, Inc., 220 USPQ 303, 313 (Fed. Cir. 1983). In this respect, each element of the claims must be shown in the cited reference. Applicant has clearly pointed out how Danknick fails to show each of the elements of claims 1-20 above. In this respect, the Office Action fails to establish a prima facie case of anticipation as is required with respect to claims 1-20.

Finally, the Office Action states that "Applicants amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office Action. Accordingly, THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL." (Office Action, page 4). However, Applicant points out that claim 15 was not amended and still stands as originally filed. No amendment to claim 15 has necessitated a new ground of rejection. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the finality of the Office Action be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully requests that all outstanding objections and rejections be withdrawn and that this application and all presently pending claims be allowed to issue. If the Examiner has any questions or comments regarding Applicant' response, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone Applicant' undersigned counsel.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael J. D'Aurelio
Reg. No. 40,977

D'Aurelio & Mathews, LLC
96 Church Street
Chagrin Falls, Ohio 44022
Phone: (440) 729-7450
Fax: (440) 729-7465

7